

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1-2, 4-18, 20-27, 29 and 31 are now present in the application. By this reply, claim 1 has been amended, and claim 31 has been added. Claim 1, 11, 22 and 31 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 1, 2, and 4-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) has been anticipated by Kim et al. (USPN 6,806,913). Claims 1, 2, and 4-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) has been anticipated by Kim et al. (USPN 6,766,528). These rejections, insofar as they pertain to the presently pending claims, are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 now recites “a remote controller for receiving guidance information provided from an outside in response to the request; and means for notifying the received guidance information.” Other independent claims 11 and 22 recites similar features in a varying scope. For instance, claim 11 recites “the requesting means and the notifying means are provided at a remote controller, and the extracting means is provided at a data broadcasting display device remotely controllable by the remote controller.” Claims 22 recites “in the step (c), the extracted guidance information is notified on a remote controller used to remotely control the data broadcasting display device.” These features are clearly absent from both Kim et al. references.

The Examiner in the Advisory Action dated August 13, 2007 stated that the term “a remote controller” is not given any patentable weight because this term occurs in a preamble. Since claims 1, 11 and 22 positively recite the remote controller, the Examiner is respectfully

requested to give the term “a remote controller” recited in claims 1, 11 and 22 a full patentable weight.

The Examiner alleged that Kim ‘913 Patent in col. 5, lines 20-29 and col. 4, lines 57-64 and Kim ‘528 Patent in col. 3, line 53 - col. 4, line 5 discloses the means for receiving guidance information provided from an outside in response to the request as recited in previously presented claim 1. However, both Kim ‘913 and Kim ‘528 fail to teach “a remote controller for receiving guidance information provided from an outside in response to the request” as recited in claim 1.

In particular, Kim ‘913 Patent in col. 5, lines 20-29 simply discloses a key input unit 210 to enter an additional information acquisition command for acquiring additional information while watching a broadcast program. Kim ‘913 Patent nowhere discloses that the key input unit 210 will *receive guidance information* provided from an outside in response to the request. In fact, the key input unit 210 is simply an input device, not a receiving device for receiving guidance information because there is no transmitter for transmitting any signal to the key input unit 210. Therefore, Kim ‘913 Patent fails to teach “a remote controller for receiving guidance information provided from an outside in response to the request” as recited in claim 1.

Similarly, Kim ‘528 Patent in col. 3, line 53 - col. 4, line 5 discloses a remote controller 101. However, Kim ‘528 Patent nowhere discloses that the remote controller 101 will *receive guidance information* provided from an outside in response to the request. In fact, the remote controller 101 is simply an input device, not a receiving device for receiving guidance information because there is no transmitter for transmitting any signal to the remote controller

101. Therefore, Kim ‘528 Patent fails to teach “a remote controller for receiving guidance information provided from an outside in response to the request” as recited in claim 1.

For the similar reasons, Kim ‘913 Patent and Kim ‘528 Patent also fail to teach “the notifying means are provided at a remote controller” as recited in claim 11, and “the extracted guidance information is notified on a remote controller used to remotely control the data broadcasting display device” as recited in claim 22.

In particular, the Examiner alleged that Kim ‘913 Patent in col. 5, lines 28-38 and Kim ‘528 Patent in col. 2, lines 33-37 and col. 5, lines 48-56 discloses the notifying means and the notifying step. However, as mentioned, the key input unit 210 and the remote controller 101 are simply input devices, not receiving devices for receiving notification of the guidance information because there is no transmitter for transmitting any signal to the key input unit 210 or the remote controller 101.

More specifically, Kim ‘913 Patent in col. 5, lines 18-38 discloses:

Accordingly, TV viewers can understand, in real time, that the additional information is being received as a result of viewing the additional information display image signal displayed on the TV screen. When a TV viewer enters an additional information acquisition command through the key input unit 210 in order to *acquire additional information while watching a broadcast program*, the video editor 208 edits a video signal recovered by the video signal processor 207 and an additional information signal recovered by the additional information processor 213 in response to a control signal generated by the controller 211 which has interpreted the input command, and *generates an additional information guide screen as shown in FIG. 4*.

FIG. 4 is a diagram of the configuration of an additional information guide screen edited by the video editor of FIG. 2. The additional information guide screen of FIG. 4 is composed of a still picture P₁, at the time when the additional information acquisition command is entered, a broadcast picture P₂ received in real time, an additional information picture P₃ corresponding to a subject selected by a user, and various input windows. (Emphasis added).

In other words, the additional information guide screen is processed by the video editor 208 and is shown on a display unit 209 (see FIG. 2), not shown or notified on the key input unit 210. Therefore, Kim '913 Patent fails to teach "the notifying means are provided at a remote controller" as recited in claim 11, and "the extracted guidance information is notified on a remote controller used to remotely control the data broadcasting display device" as recited in claim 22.

Kim '528 Patent in col. 2, lines 33-37 and col. 5, lines 48-56 discloses:

The additional information data regarding a program being displayed on the display unit is read from the storage 108 by the controller 109 and temporarily stored in the memory 110. The controller 109 then *informs users through the display unit 107 that there is additional information for the program being displayed*. If there is a request to view the additional information from the user, the controller 109 reads the additional information data stored in the memory 110 and displays the information on the display unit 107. (Emphasis added).

The controller 201 extracts the detail information corresponding to the selected object from the object data memory 203, temporarily stores the extracted information in the memory 110, and reads and *displays the detail information from the memory 110 on the display unit 107* at a preset position around the selected object of the program being displayed. Namely, detail information on all or one object(s) selected by the remote control 101 is displayed at a preset position around a corresponding object.

In other words, the extracted information is displayed on the *display unit 107*, not shown or notified on the remote control 101. Therefore, Kim '528 Patent also fails to teach "the notifying means are provided at a remote controller" as recited in claim 11, and "the extracted guidance information is notified on a remote controller used to remotely control the data broadcasting display device" as recited in claim 22.

Since Kim '913 Patent and Kim '528 Patent fail to teach each and every recitation of independent claims 1, 11 and 22, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11 and 22 clearly define the present invention over the references relied on by the Examiner.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (USPN 6,806,913) in view of the Background of the instant application. This rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of claim 30. Thus, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Additional Claims

Claim 31 has been added for the Examiner's consideration. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of elements as set forth in new independent claim 31 is not disclosed or suggested by the references relied on by the Examiner. Favorable consideration and allowance of claims 31 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant respectfully petitions for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a response in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: September 4, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Esther H. Chong #39,538
Esther H. Chong
Registration No.: 40,953
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant

cn